

REPORT OF REGIONAL CONFERENCE
OF EXTENSION FORESTERS OF NORTHEAST
HELD IN CASCO, MAINE, SEPTEMBER 25, 26, 27, 1946

Reserve

The conference was opened promptly at 2 p.m., September 25, with J. A. Cope, extension forester of New York, in the chair and Earl Scovell, of New Jersey, as secretary.* Those present** were:

A. D. Nutting, extension forester, Maine
K. E. Barracough, extension forester, New Hampshire
Charles Larson, extension forester, Vermont
R. B. Parmenter, extension forester, Massachusetts
R. N. Jorgensen, extension forester, Rhode Island
Floyd Callward, extension forester, Connecticut
J. A. Cope, extension forester, New York
F. E. Winch, assistant extension forester, New York
F. T. Murphey, extension forester, Pennsylvania
W. W. Simonds, assistant extension forester, Pennsylvania
E. L. Scovell, extension forester, New Jersey
J. L. Boatman, Chief, Division of Subject Matter, Extension Service, Washington, D. C.
W. K. Williams, forestry specialist, Extension Service, Washington, D. C.

G. E. Lord, assistant director of extension of Maine, gave an official greeting to the group and brought us up to date on Maine's climate, resources, forests, and wood-using industries. He believes that the extension foresters' greatest opportunities lie in grasping and maintaining a strong and continuous leadership in farm forestry education.

I. What Are the Respective Fields, Functions, and Responsibilities of the Forestry Program Sponsored by the Clarke-McNary and Norris-Doxey Acts?

J. L. Boatman, Chief, Division of Subject Matter, U. S. Extension Service, read the following paper:

The subject assigned to me is a very broad one and indeed might well cover all the deliberations of this conference. However, since this is a discussion conference and it is highly desirable that others make contributions, I shall confine my remarks to high lights of the farm forestry program as we see them from the Federal point of view. It is hoped that many questions will be raised during the conference and that out of our

* E. L. Scovell died in February 1947 before he had an opportunity to complete the compilations of the proceedings.

** It is of interest to record that seven of the group have at present a total service in extension work of 155 years, or an average of 22 years per man.

exchange of views will come suggestions for strengthening the forestry program which each of you can take back to your director for consideration and adoption if conditions merit such action.

Doubtless we all recognize that the forested area of the Northeast presents the largest area problem we have to deal with in the field of agriculture. Data conveniently available, assembled by the National Resources Planning Board for the six New England States, show that in this part of the Northeast approximately 30 million acres, or 70 percent, is forested and $8\frac{1}{4}$ million acres, or 20 percent, is in agricultural production. Drawing on this same source again, we find that 96 percent of the estimated standing timber in New England is privately owned, that large commercial holdings found especially in northern New England amount to $82\frac{1}{2}$ percent, and that farm wood lots in southern New England constitute almost 50 percent of the forested area. This situation, which probably obtains in other sections of the Northeast, indicates that farm woodlands should be a dominant factor in forest production. Judging from the condition of cut-over lands we observed this morning in coming up from Portsmouth there remains a big job of building up production on these lands.

Naturally, we are confronted by many problems in inaugurating a program of forest management, especially where numerous ownerships are involved. Many of these problems can be solved only through the cooperative efforts of industry, farmers, and public agencies. The job of the Extension Service in the field of forestry is one of providing an educational service to farm forest owners and the general public with a view to bringing about a clearer understanding of the value of timber resources and the problems of placing them under management. A very important phase of this program is the "know how" or giving on-the-ground assistance with the application of good forest management, utilization, and marketing practices. Although a splendid start has been made in many States, the time has now arrived when we should intensify our efforts.

(1) Federal assistance to farm forest owners.

In order to provide a bird's-eye picture of the Department's farm forestry program it might be well at this time to indicate the Federal assistance available during the current fiscal year.

Clarke-McNary Act) Extension forestry - - - - -	\$108,000	<u>1/</u>	<u>2/</u>
) Tree-planting stock distribution -	\$123,000	<u>3/</u>	
) Forest fire protection - - - - -	\$8,300,000		
Norris-Doxey Act) Research - - - - -	\$ 22,000		
) Farm woodland management projects-	\$415,000		
General Forest Service author- ization) Private forestry cooperation - - -	\$103,000		
) (for assistance on industrial and farm lands)			

1/ Includes \$43,000 Norris-Doxey funds.

2/ \$19,080 - Total extension funds allotted to Northeastern States for Fiscal Year, 1946.

3/ Includes \$40,000 Norris-Doxey funds.

This Federal assistance will be supplemented by a much larger research program than is indicated by Norris-Doxey research funds. The Forest Service has informed me that the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station field program during the current year will involve an expenditure of \$254,323 for forest management investigations, including \$47,500 for experimental forests, and \$153,000 for forest management research in the spruce-fir types in connection with control of the spruce budworm.

The experimental forests are located as follows:

<u>Forest</u>	<u>Headquarters</u>
Nessabesic	Alfred, Maine
Anthracite	Kingston, Pa.
Beltsville	Laurel, Md.
Kane	Kane, Pa.
Northern Maine Spruce Fir	Orono, Maine
New Hampshire - Vermont Spruce Fir	Laconia, N. H.
Adirondacks Spruce Fir	Cooperstown, N. Y.

While on the subject of research it should be added that Congress wanted an over-all 5-year research plan to cover timber, grazing, and water utilization and processing. In response to this the Forest Service developed a plan to set up work centers involving 10 to 12 million acres, each to be centrally located where actual research will be carried out. These clinics will develop data that foresters can use as practitioners. They will also serve as demonstrations where extension foresters can bring their clients to see what is happening. The principal task of these research centers will be to keep ahead of the practitioner or the man that is going to use the information.

Another new project is the Forest Utilization Service, of the Forest Service, which has established seven utilization units. One of these has been set up in Philadelphia with a budget of about \$30,000 to cover work in the Northeastern States. Plans call for surveys and investigations dealing with little-used wood species; problems of the turning industry; substitution of species, such as the use of more hardwood in pulp and paper making; mechanization of forest operations; kiln drying; and other utilization work of value to industry, farm wood lot owners, and foresters. Cooperation will be extended to all forest owners, and encouragement will be given to State agencies to carry on supplemental research.

I have gone into some detail in regard to forest research because I believe it is a matter of great importance to extension foresters. As research develops, greater responsibility rests on the specialist group to see that farm forestry problems are properly evaluated. It also behooves the specialist to keep abreast with latest findings and to assist forest owners with the application of these findings.

The Forest Service has assured me that it welcomes suggestions of the Extension group with respect to farm woodland problems, and it is looking to the forestry specialists to use these forest clinics and to assist with the big job of extending research information to forest owners.

(2) Cooperation with land-grant colleges and responsibilities in promoting the farm forestry program.

Since the passage of the Clarke-McNary Act in 1924 the Federal Extension Service has recognized the importance of farm woodlands and has felt that the forested area on the farm should receive comparable attention to that given to other crops. Though extension forestry has not developed so rapidly as agronomy, livestock, and other phases of extension work, we have given considerable thought to forestry and to rather numerous suggestions for developing the farm forestry program. We have encouraged the State extension services to employ forestry specialists to develop State programs for extending forestry information and giving assistance to farm owners. Definite progress has been made. With the passage of the Norris-Doxey Act in 1937 a much greater interest in farm forestry developed in both State and Federal agencies. Relations in the administration of this act have required numerous discussions out of which have come a clearer understanding of the Norris-Doxey program and incidentally a greater appreciation of the place that woodlands hold in the farm economy. I wish to say that there has been no diminution of interest in extension forestry, in fact the responsibilities of the Cooperative Extension Service in this field of work are understood better today than previously. Knowing the thinking of Extension people on this subject, I can safely say that it is not only our desire but our determination to carry forward an extension program which will more adequately serve farmers in this field. The farm economy as well as the national welfare requires fullest production from farm forest resources. To assist in bringing this about is an inescapable responsibility of the Cooperative Extension Service.

In June of this year, when the Extension Organization and Policy Committee of the Land-Grant College Association met in Washington, I was asked to discuss forestry relationships principally in connection with programs under the Norris-Doxey Act. It might be of interest to this group for me to bring out a few of the points which I discussed at that time.

Probably some of you have operational problems arising from phases of the Department's farm forestry program in your State, and it is proper that we should discuss them. However, inasmuch as some of these matters were discussed in the Farm Forestry Seminar Conference held in Washington in March of this year and each of you has received a copy of the report, I will pass over this subject in the hope that you will raise any questions of particular concern during the discussion period.

(3) Need for additional funds to employ extension foresters.

For some time the Cooperative Extension Service has been eager to expand the farm forestry program, and many directors have expressed a definite need for more funds to employ extension foresters. One of the most interesting developments in this connection was a survey conducted by Director D. W. Watkins, of South Carolina, when he was chairman of the forestry sub-committee. Probably some of you are familiar with the survey or took part in the work of that committee. At the April 1946 meeting of the Extension Organization and Policy Committee Director Sanders, of Louisiana, reported for Director Watkins on the results of this survey. Thirty-one States replying to Director Watkins' questionnaire indicated that the need for personnel to enable the State extension services to do an adequate job in farm forestry would require an increase in Federal funds of \$339,360,

to be matched by an equal amount of State funds. It is interesting to note that the additional funds requested by the 31 States plus State matching funds would provide for an increase of about 170 extension foresters. This is a definite recognition on the part of the directors that the forestry program should be expanded to meet increasing responsibilities in this field of extension work. In response to this recommendation the Federal Extension Service has made some requests which we hope will benefit the program.

We feel that extension foresters have a big job to do in getting forestry practiced on more farms. Overcutting, which was so prevalent in some sections during the war period, should cease. The rebuilding of depleted stands, the adoption of better cutting practices, reforestation of idle lands, and the production of lumber products for farm use and for industry are activities that will doubtless require considerable attention. In carrying out the many phases of the forestry program we should not lose sight of the fact that the extension specialist should plan his work with a view to coordinating State efforts in this field and should serve as a subject-matter specialist to county agents and to foresters working on the county level. As pointed out, the farm forestry program can be strengthened through keeping abreast with developments in research, marketing and utilization, including new equipment for conducting forest operations. Many of you have already made splendid progress in these and other phases of forestry work. I should like to reemphasize the point that in designing the State program we should make sure that it is developed in cooperation with all other agencies interested in the field of farm forestry.

(4) Farm forestry pilot counties.

A most interesting suggestion was made at the June 1946 meeting of the Committee on Extension Organization and Policy. I have already referred to my discussion with this group and wish now to call your attention to a recommendation made by the group, namely, that an attempt be made to set up pilot counties with an assistant county agent trained in forestry. Incidentally, the Federal Extension office was asked to follow up on this proposal in States where such counties may be selected. This suggestion is the result of considerable deliberation on farm forestry and might well develop into a substantial program, particularly in States with large areas of forest land. If my information is correct there are at least 800 counties in the United States with timber problems sufficient to justify the employment of assistant county agents in forestry. One of the first questions to arise in this connection is that of funds. You are no doubt familiar with the Bankhead-Flannagan Act and the fact that funds from this act are intended largely for work in the counties. If the allotment to the State extension service is not committed to other purposes it might well be used for the setting up of forestry pilot counties. We have received a favorable response from several States on the pilot county recommendation and hope that a number will be established within the current year.

(5) Relations with State forestry departments.

The Federal Forest Service and Extension Service are committed to a program of close cooperation with State forestry agencies. It is our desire that the State agencies develop a coordinated program, or at least come to an

understanding on the fields of responsibilities of both agencies conducting farm forestry work in the State. The idea of mutual benefit through working together has been accepted in a number of States. We hope progress in this direction will continue, as only through this means can most effective service be rendered to farm woodland owners. A splendid example of a coordinated forestry effort is the unified forestry program as developed by the State forestry department and the Extension Service in New Hampshire. I mention this because it offers a solution for the problem of how to coordinate farm forestry in a manner that will create better working relationships. I am pleased to note that this subject is on the agenda, and I hope that during the course of the discussion Mr. Barraclough will give us some details of his program.

In closing my remarks I wish to say that the extension forestry work in the Northeast is well rooted as a part of the extension program. It is my observation that extension workers are becoming more forestry-minded. Obviously this is one of the fruits of your labors. Farm owners are manifesting greater interest in forest practices, and many of them, through land use and other groups, are registering their wishes for more assistance. On the whole the forest extension picture is bright. The task is a large one and responsibilities are decidedly challenging. By applying ourselves unflaggingly I am sure we will continue to see substantial progress.

Mr. Barraclough's paper, How Can Extension Foresters in the Northeast Work Together for the Advancement of Farm Forestry in This Region? was presented on the second day of the conference. It is included at this point, since it also deals with the activities under the Clarke-McNary and Norris-Doxey Acts.

How can extension foresters in the Northeast work together for the advancement of farm forestry in this region?

If we are to work together for the advancement of farm forestry, it is important that we have a common objective. Do we all see the forest, or do some, perhaps, have their eyes just on the trees? Section 5 of the Clarke-McNary Act contemplates both assistance to individual farm owners in various forms of timber growing and educational or extension work in forestry among farm owners by groups.

I have studied Memorandum 537 many times since it was issued May 25, 1925, and I always conclude the statement is a broad basic document upon which to build a State farm forestry educational program. I have refused to become confused by the many statements made since 1925 often designed to muddy the waters in the field we are laboring.

In a long letter sent to me by a forester of the U. S. Forest Service, the following statement is made. He refers to a paper I presented before the Massachusetts Forest and Park Association, January 31, 1946, covering the subject of extension education in farm forestry.

We may actually be thinking about the same thing, but several points made in your paper disturb me considerably. This particular program* was not started as an educational program,

* The Norris-Doxey Program.

and in my presentations to the Budget Bureau and to Congress I have stressed the service aspects which should greatly predominate in the activities of the local forester. That there will be a certain amount of education and demonstration involved is inevitable, but we feel very strongly that the educational job should rest primarily with the extension forester. We have no desire to take over that field of work under the guise of doing a service job. On the other hand, we definitely do not want to see a project designed to give service diverted into the educational field.

We consider that it is not the job of the project forester to make speeches, do extension work with 4-H Clubs and the like; we think it is largely up to the extension forester to advertise the availability of the project forester for service jobs. Such is our understanding with Congress and to do otherwise puts me in a difficult position all around.

I should make it clear that we are not trying to usurp the field of the consulting forester. In truth, our project foresters should--as your paper indicates--throw a lot of business to these men. We never should plan to tackle sizable jobs that private foresters should handle. There still remain, however, many hundreds of thousands of jobs that consulting foresters will never be employed on for the simple reason that the landowner cannot afford to employ technical assistance and our experience amply demonstrates that consulting foresters do not care to be bothered with jobs so small. It is my hope that many of our project foresters will see the opportunities in consulting work and will set up in business for themselves after they have gotten the experience which our jobs will give them.

The following statement is my reply to the forester's letter.

In spite of the tendency on the part of some people in the United States Department of Agriculture to divide a program into tight and unrelated compartments, we people that work directly with the farmers and other woodland owners find that a general educational program and an intensive educational program, when applied in the field, blend into one program, if our efforts are worthwhile and efficient.

The terms service and intensive education are synonymous unless we think of service in the same way a garage man services a car, or a contractor builds a house. If service to farmers is to be interpreted in this manner, the Norris-Doxey foresters are then truly agents for the farmers. They would negotiate contracts for farmers, mark the timber, make estimates, arrange for cutting, get the logs to the mill, and make sure that the farmers receive payment for the products. In case of a dispute between a buyer and a farmer, the agent of the farmer (Norris-Doxey forester) probably can be taken into court for settlement of a claim.

Such an interpretation of service rendered to farmers when Norris-Doxey funds are involved, can be questioned, if I understand the Norris-Doxey Act correctly. ("To advise farmers regarding the establishment, protection, and management of farm forests and forest and shrub plantations and the harvesting, utilization, and marketing of the products thereof . . .")

When we persuade a farmer to make his woodlands a demonstration area by having the forester mark selected trees for cutting and by having the forester advise the farmer in order to bring about the efficient marketing of the products, we are, I believe, conforming with the intent of the Norris-Doxey Act and, at the same time, obtaining the maximum spread of influence. The greater the number of demonstrations we establish in all the communities of New Hampshire, the more effective will be our efforts.

I have observed the work of Norris-Doxey foresters in some of the other States, and certainly they are doing educational work. The Forest Service may label the activity of the Norris-Doxey foresters as a service program, but any fair-minded person would be bound to say that they are doing intensive educational work. When we try to distinguish between the terms intensive education and service, we are confronted with the old adage of "the pot calls the kettle black."

I can assure you I am interested in organizing a forestry program in New Hampshire that will result in the maximum amount of forestry practices in farm woodlands, and other small woodland holdings.

I have not presented the statements from the two letters with the thought of bringing out a conflict of opinion between two individuals. My desire is to present the thinking in New Hampshire relative to farm forestry education.

There is much talk today about forest regulation. In our State the subject is receiving serious consideration. A proposed regulatory bill has been drafted for presentation to our General Court next winter. We people in the field of education have no objection to the proposal. In fact, we have had a hand in helping to draft the bill. If the people of New Hampshire decide that forest regulation is necessary, the need for intensive education in the field of forestry will become more important.

We have established the educational program in forestry upon the principle set forth by Director Kendall many years ago: (1) That the responsibility for educational work in forestry rests with the authorized educational agency delegated to do extension teaching and (2) the responsibility for regulatory work rests with the proper State department.

In spite of the rather simple foundation laid in 1925 for the construction of a comprehensive program of extension education in forestry, we are confronted with a confused situation today.

Back in 1924, the Federal Extension Service was given the job of administering and getting the farm forestry program under way in the States. At the time there was no great interest in the program on the part of other Federal agencies. By 1937, all State and Federal agencies concerned with forest problems claimed the right to administer the farm forestry program. As often happens under such circumstances, a compromise was arrived at in Washington. It resulted in an arrangement whereby the United States Forest Service was to administer the funds available under the Farm Forestry Act. It was left to the interested agencies in each State to arrive at an understanding in the use of the funds. This arrangement has not worked too well. In some States the United States Forest Service administers the farm forestry program, in others the State forester is responsible for the

intensive educational program in farm forestry, while the State college continues with an extension forester. Generally speaking, the United States Forest Service has been inclined to throw its influence with the State forestry departments.

We people in New Hampshire concerned with this problem recognize the difficulties confronting us in carrying on an intensive educational program in forestry. We can appreciate that education should not always be confined to farmers and small woodland owners if we are to continue an aggressive educational program. Few people outside of the Extension Service understand or appreciate the objectives of a comprehensive extension program. I sometimes wonder if Extension people are not apt to compromise principle for the sake of immediate peace to the extent that the objectives of extension teaching are dissipated.

Extension foresters in the Northeast can work together for the advancement of farm forestry in the region if first we have a common objective. What is our objective? Second, once we decide upon our objective, it is important that we be leaders in our field of endeavor. While a program of attack presents many difficulties, it is the only course to follow if one is to gain a desired objective. We cannot expect to maintain leadership in the field of farm forestry education by attempting to hold back the efforts of other groups and agencies who desire to participate in this field. As I view the situation, we should utilize the services of all groups and agencies available to us in so far as such help encourages woodland owners to manage their woodlands properly. However, we should not be crowded out of a position of leadership in the field of farm forestry education.

The following points were developed out of the discussion subsequent to the presentation of the papers:

1. It is generally recognized by the agencies involved that separating the administrative responsibility for the Clarke-McNary and Norris-Doxey Acts at the Federal level resulted in much confusion at both the Federal and State levels.
2. No clear-cut policy defining the respective responsibilities and functions of the programs sponsored by these two acts has been worked out on the Federal level. Some important progress, however, has been made at the Federal level in bringing about a clear understanding of the problems involved.
3. The chief obstacle to obtaining a clear-cut definition of policies pertaining to these two acts has been the complicity of cooperative agreements and commitments between the Federal agencies themselves and between them and the State agencies.
4. Lacking a clearly defined policy at the Federal level, the plan has been to let the agencies in each State arrive at a policy at the State level. This has been unsatisfactory all around. There are about as many different arrangements and policies as there are States in the region. In most of these States the U. S. Forest Service has thrown its influence toward the State foresters. In some of the States neither the Extension Service nor the land-grant college officials were approached on the subject until after commitments had been made with the State forestry agency.

5. Generally speaking, the policy as it has been engineered has been to divide those two programs at the State level as was originally done at the Federal level.

6. Confusion exists generally throughout the region as to the respective fields and functions of the two programs. While there is some semblance of agreement on the differences between education and service, the issue is befogged by the repeated insertion of two other terms, "intensive education" and "action programs."

7. Intensive education as practiced by the Norris-Doxey forester is really a combination of education and service. In actual operation it is difficult to the point of impossibility to define where one leaves off and the other begins.

8. The terms action agency and action programs are carefully conceived means of befogging the issue. Any fair-minded person knows that education is action and results usually in more action than straight service.

9. The term intensive education does not describe the function of the Norris-Doxey foresters as they are generally operating in the region.

What has been and can be done to coordinate these two programs and other forestry programs at the State level?

In a few of the States in the region, cooperative agreements between the Extension Service and other agencies have been worked out. No two of these agreements are alike either in content or application in the field. Even in these States, it is doubtful if the administrators and personnel of these other agencies understand the objectives of a comprehensive extension education program. Nor do they see in it much of value that cannot be replaced by a vigorous service program.

The extension foresters present reported on the status of the Norris-Doxey foresters in their respective States.

Massachusetts--Two Norris-Doxey foresters working under the direct supervision of the U. S. Forest Service. No State forester provides offset funds and the extension forester is in the picture only in an advisory capacity.

Vermont--The 10 foresters on Norris-Doxey funds matching funds supplied by State forester's office and supervise the responsibility of the State forester.

Rhode Island--No Norris-Doxey forester in State. Extension forester one-half time teaching, one-half time extension.

New Hampshire--Seven Norris-Doxey foresters operating on county basis under direct supervision of its extension forester. They are carrying on a combination of intensive education and service along the lines suggested in Barracough's report.

Maine--Two Norris-Doxey foresters working under direct supervision of the U. S. Forest Service. No State forester provides the offset funds. The extension forester functions in an advisory capacity.

Connecticut--State divided into four districts with a Norris-Doxey forester operating in each under the direct supervision of the State forester.

New York--Five Norris-Doxey foresters operating in widely separated areas under supervision of the State forester.

New Jersey--Two Norris-Doxey foresters in the State, one supervised by the State forester (cash offset), one supervised by the Forest Service.

Pennsylvania--Nine Norris-Doxey foresters supervised entirely by the State forester's office.

Maryland--Five Norris-Doxey foresters supervised by the State forester's office.

West Virginia--Seven Norris-Doxey foresters supervised by the State forester.

This represents a total of 43 farm foresters, all but seven of which (New Hampshire) are supervised by the State forester's office.

In conclusion three special lines of activities were outlined which we as extension foresters and educators could stress and develop:

1. 4-H forestry.

2. Spreading specialized services and information to meet farmer needs: (a) Power equipment, (b) pest treating, (c) growing and marketing Christmas trees, (d) production of maple sirup, (e) use of native woods in home construction, and (f) development of wood-burning equipment for home heating.

3. Cooperation with industry: (a) Furthering education program by requesting support and (b) rendering service to farmer in marketing raw products or in furnishing him with wood products.

It was further felt by the group that it was up to the Executive Committee of the Land-Grant College Association to clarify policies and take a more active interest in the problem of farm forestry. The fact they have not done so in the past has left each extension director and his forester to pursue their own course of action without feeling that the land-grant college and experiment stations were there in the background.

Research in Relation to an Extension Program in Forestry

A full half day's session was spent in discussing this important topic. A special committee consisting of Scovell, Murphey, Nutting, and Larsen presented the following report which was adopted.

Report of the Resolutions Committee on Farm Forestry Research

I. Farm forestry research should be given far greater consideration, and therefore we recommend that:

1. All funds appropriated for forest research be allocated to farm forestry and nonfarm forestry in proportion to their relative acreages.

2. All farm forestry research be carried on by or in cooperation with the respective State agricultural experiment station within the region.

II. Extension Foresters lack specific information in many phases of their work and believe that this need or lack can only be met through adequate research in local farm forestry problems. Among the various fields in which we feel research is important, we list the following:

1. Labor income from woodland crops in comparison with that from other crops on the same farm.
2. Utilization of the farm forest crop. This should include use of the forest crops on the farm as well as those sold off the farm.
3. Relative merits of existing methods and equipment now available in harvesting and processing of the farm wood lot crop. Also, the development of new and more efficient methods.
4. To study the planting, management, utilization, and marketing of specialized tree crops, such as maple products, Christmas trees, and protection forests.

Again we should like to emphasize that these studies must be made in and for local conditions in order to be useful to extension foresters. Major emphasis should be placed on short-term research projects.

Chairman Cope, as extension forester representative on the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station Advisory Council, was instructed to call these resolutions to the attention of the director of the Northeastern Forest Experiment Station at the forthcoming meeting of the Advisory Council.

The meeting closed with a note of appreciation to Boatman and Williams for their part in the discussions and to Farmenter and Nutting in arranging the program.

The third day of the conference consisted of a field trip covering both the silvicultural and utilization aspects of Maine's farm forests. On the silvicultural front the foresters as usual did not agree. The discussion whether to thin or not to thin a thrifty young white pine stand became so heated that our unperturbed host was called on for some "cold water" to reduce the fire hazard.

It was voted to adjourn subject to the call of the chairman.

Prepared by J. A. Cope, Chairman
with notes taken by E. L. Scovell,
Secretary, now deceased.